

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 SANDRA C.,¹) Case No. EDCV 17-1379-JPR
12)
13 Plaintiff,)
14) MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER
15 v.) AFFIRMING COMMISSIONER
16)
17 NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting)
18 Commissioner of Social)
19 Security,)
20)
21 Defendant.)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
2202
2203
2204
2205
2206
2207
2208
2209
2210
2211
2212
2213
2214
2215

1 filed June 11, 2018, which the Court has taken under submission
2 without oral argument. For the reasons stated below, the
3 Commissioner's decision is affirmed.

4 **II. BACKGROUND**

5 Plaintiff was born in 1963. (Administrative Record ("AR")
6 43.) She completed high school (AR 44) and worked as a mail
7 handler, assembler, recovery clerk, and childcare provider (AR
8 45-47).

9 On August 30, 2013, Plaintiff applied for DIB, alleging that
10 she had been disabled since October 15, 2011, the day after an
11 earlier final decision finding her not disabled. (AR 179-82; see
12 also AR 76-77, 83.) She applied for SSI the same day, alleging
13 that she had been disabled since January 1, 2012. (AR 183-91;
14 see also AR 95.) She claimed disability from "[f]ibromyalgia,
15 tinnitus, ankylosing spondylitis, [and] obesity" as well as type-
16 2 diabetes, high blood pressure, Bell's Palsy, back injury,
17 asthma, hypothyroidism, and sleep apnea. (AR 227.) After her
18 applications were denied initially (AR 93, 105) and the DIB
19 application was denied on reconsideration (AR 119, 127-31), she
20 requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (AR 135-
21 36). A hearing was held on December 3, 2015, at which Plaintiff,
22 who was represented by an attorney, testified, as did a
23 vocational expert. (AR 39-62.) In a written decision issued
24 April 19, 2016, the ALJ found Plaintiff not disabled. (AR 23-
25 33.) Plaintiff requested review from the Appeals Council (AR
26 19), which denied it on May 12, 2017 (AR 3-5). This action
27 followed.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), a district court may review the Commissioner's decision to deny benefits. The ALJ's findings and decision should be upheld if they are free of legal error and supported by substantial evidence based on the record as a whole. See Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971); Parra v. Astrue, 481 F.3d 742, 746 (9th Cir. 2007). Substantial evidence means such evidence as a reasonable person might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. Richardson, 402 U.S. at 401; Lingenfelter v. Astrue, 504 F.3d 1028, 1035 (9th Cir. 2007). It is more than a scintilla but less than a preponderance. Lingenfelter, 504 F.3d at 1035 (citing Robbins v. Soc. Sec. Admin., 466 F.3d 880, 882 (9th Cir. 2006)). To determine whether substantial evidence supports a finding, the reviewing court "must review the administrative record as a whole, weighing both the evidence that supports and the evidence that detracts from the Commissioner's conclusion." Reddick v. Chater, 157 F.3d 715, 720 (9th Cir. 1998). "If the evidence can reasonably support either affirming or reversing," the reviewing court "may not substitute its judgment" for the Commissioner's. Id. at 720-21.

IV. THE EVALUATION OF DISABILITY

People are "disabled" for purposes of receiving Social Security benefits if they are unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity owing to a physical or mental impairment that is expected to result in death or has lasted, or is expected to last, for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(1)(A); Drouin v. Sullivan, 966 F.2d 1255, 1257 (9th Cir.

1992).

A. The Five-Step Evaluation Process

The ALJ follows a five-step sequential evaluation process to assess whether a claimant is disabled. 20 C.F.R.

§§ 404.1520(a)(4), 416.920(a)(4); Lester v. Chater, 81 F.3d 821, 828 n.5 (9th Cir. 1995) (as amended Apr. 9, 1996). In the first step, the Commissioner must determine whether the claimant is currently engaged in substantial gainful activity; if so, the claimant is not disabled and the claim must be denied.

§§ 404.1520(a)(4)(i), 416.920(a)(4)(i).

If the claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity, the second step requires the Commissioner to determine whether the claimant has a "severe" impairment or combination of impairments significantly limiting her ability to do basic work activities; if not, the claimant is not disabled and her claim must be denied. §§ 404.1520(a)(4)(ii), 416.920(a)(4)(ii).

If the claimant has a "severe" impairment or combination of impairments, the third step requires the Commissioner to determine whether the impairment or combination of impairments meets or equals an impairment in the Listing of Impairments set forth at 20 C.F.R. part 404, subpart P, appendix 1; if so, disability is conclusively presumed. §§ 404.1520(a)(4)(iii), 416.920(a)(4)(iii).

If the claimant's impairment or combination of impairments does not meet or equal an impairment in the Listing, the fourth step requires the Commissioner to determine whether the claimant

1 has sufficient residual functional capacity ("RFC")² to perform
2 her past work; if so, she is not disabled and the claim must be
3 denied. §§ 404.1520(a)(4)(iv), 416.920(a)(4)(iv). The claimant
4 has the burden of proving she is unable to perform past relevant
5 work. Drouin, 966 F.2d at 1257. If the claimant meets that
6 burden, a prima facie case of disability is established. Id.

7 If that happens or if the claimant has no past relevant
8 work, the Commissioner then bears the burden of establishing that
9 the claimant is not disabled because she can perform other
10 substantial gainful work available in the national economy.

11 §§ 404.1520(a)(4)(v), 416.920(a)(4)(v); Drouin, 966 F.2d at 1257.
12 That determination comprises the fifth and final step in the
13 sequential analysis. §§ 404.1520(a)(4)(v), 416.920(a)(4)(v);
14 Lester, 81 F.3d at 828 n.5; Drouin, 966 F.2d at 1257.

15 B. The ALJ's Application of the Five-Step Process

16 The ALJ found that Plaintiff had not shown "changed
17 circumstances material to the determination of disability" since
18 her last denial and thus had not rebutted the presumption of
19 continuing disability. (AR 24.) He therefore found that res
20 judicata applied and adopted the findings of the prior decision.
21 (Id.) He then nonetheless applied the five-step process.

22 At step one, the ALJ found that Plaintiff had not engaged in
23 substantial gainful activity since October 15, 2011, the alleged
24

25 ² RFC is what a claimant can do despite existing exertional
26 and nonexertional limitations. §§ 404.1545, 416.945; see Cooper
27 v. Sullivan, 880 F.2d 1152, 1155 n.5 (9th Cir. 1989). The
28 Commissioner assesses the claimant's RFC between steps three and
four. Laborin v. Berryhill, 867 F.3d 1151, 1153 (9th Cir. 2017)
(citing § 416.920(a)(4)).

1 disability onset date.³ (AR 26.) At step two, he concluded that
2 she had the following severe impairments: "fibromyalgia; obesity;
3 Bell's Palsy; and asthma[.]" (Id.) At step three, he found that
4 she did not have an impairment or combination of impairments that
5 met or equaled a Listing. (AR 28.)

6 At step four, the ALJ found that Plaintiff had the RFC to
7 perform modified light work:

8 [She can] lift and carry 20 pounds occasionally and 10
9 pounds frequently; and sit, stand, and walk for six hours
10 each in an eight-hour workday. [She] must alternate
11 positions every hour for one to three minutes but remain
12 at the workstation. [She] is able to occasionally climb
13 but never ladders, ropes, or scaffolds. [She] is able to
14 occasionally balance, stoop, kneel, crouch, and crawl.
15 [She] can frequently [perform] fine and gross
16 manipulation. [She] should avoid extreme cold, extreme
17 noise, vibration, pulmonary irritants, and hazards.

18 (Id.)

19 Based on the VE's testimony, the ALJ concluded that
20 Plaintiff could perform her past relevant work as a "[m]ail
21 handler," DOT 209.687-014, 1991 WL 671810 (Jan. 1, 2016), and as
22 a "[s]ales attendant (recovery clerk)," DOT 299.677-010, 1991 WL
23 672643 (Jan. 1, 2016). (AR 31.) Thus, he found Plaintiff not
24 disabled. (AR 32.)

26
27 ³ Plaintiff's SSI application lists January 1, 2012, as the
28 disability onset date. (AR 183.) The ALJ apparently used the
onset date listed on her DIB application to analyze both claims.
(AR 23, 26.)

1 **V. DISCUSSION⁴**

2 Plaintiff argues that the ALJ erred by failing to articulate
3 appropriate reasons for rejecting her subjective symptom
4 testimony. (J. Stip. at 5-14.) For the reasons discussed below,
5 remand is not warranted.

6 A. Plaintiff Has Forfeited Her Appeal by Never Contesting
7 the ALJ's Chavez Ruling

8 1. *Applicable law*

9 a. Chavez

10 When an ALJ has issued a final decision finding a claimant
11 not disabled, an ALJ considering a subsequent claim regarding an
12 unadjudicated period must "apply a presumption of continuing
13 nondisability and determine that the claimant is not disabled,
14 unless the claimant rebuts the presumption." SSAR 97-4(9), 1997
15 WL 742758, at *3 (Dec. 3, 1997); see also Chavez v. Bowen, 844
16 F.2d 691, 693 (9th Cir. 1988) ("The principles of res judicata
17 apply to administrative decisions, although the doctrine is
18 applied less rigidly to administrative proceedings than to
19 judicial proceedings."). A claimant may rebut the presumption of
20

21
22 ⁴ In Lucia v. SEC, 138 S. Ct. 2044, 2055 (2018), the Supreme
23 Court held that ALJs of the Securities and Exchange Commission
24 are "Officers of the United States" and thus subject to the
25 Appointments Clause. To the extent Lucia applies to Social
26 Security ALJs, Plaintiff has forfeited the issue by failing to
27 raise it during her administrative proceedings. (See AR 37-62,
28 135-36.); Meanel v. Apfel, 172 F.3d 1111, 1115 (9th Cir. 1999)
(as amended) (plaintiff forfeits issues not raised before ALJ or
Appeals Council); see also generally Kabani & Co. v. SEC, 733 F.
App'x 918, 919 (9th Cir. 2018) (rejecting Lucia challenge because
plaintiff did not raise it during administrative proceedings),
pet. for cert. filed, __ U.S.L.W. __ (U.S. Feb. 22, 2019) (No.
18-1117).

1 nondisability by showing "'changed circumstances' indicating a
2 greater disability." Chavez, 844 F.3d at 693 (quoting Taylor v.
3 Heckler, 765 F.2d 872, 875 (9th Cir. 1985)); Lester, 81 F.3d at
4 827 (same). Changed circumstances include an increase in the
5 severity of a previously existing impairment, a change in age
6 category, and any new issue, "such as the existence of an
7 impairment not considered in the previous application." Lester,
8 81 F.3d at 827.

9 b. Forfeiture

10 In Meanel v. Apfel, 172 F.3d 1111, 1115 (9th Cir. 1999) (as
11 amended), the Ninth Circuit held that "at least when claimants
12 are represented by counsel, they must raise all issues and
13 evidence at their administrative hearings in order to preserve
14 them on appeal" or those issues are forfeited. Indeed, when a
15 claimant fails entirely to raise an issue before both the ALJ and
16 the Appeals Council, she "forfeits such a challenge on appeal, at
17 least when that claimant is represented by counsel." Shaibi v.
18 Berryhill, 883 F.3d 1102, 1109 (9th Cir. 2017) (as amended Feb.
19 28, 2018); see also Phillips v. Colvin, 593 F. App'x 683, 684
20 (9th Cir. 2015) (finding that "issue was waived⁵ by [claimant]'s
21 failure to raise it at the administrative level when he was
22 represented by counsel").

23 Similarly, claims not raised in the district court are
24

25 ⁵ Some of the cases refer to "waiver," although the issue is
26 actually forfeiture. See United States v. Scott, 705 F.3d 410,
27 415 (9th Cir. 2012) ("Waiver is the intentional relinquishment or
28 abandonment of a known right, whereas forfeiture is the failure
to make the timely assertion of that right." (citation and
alterations omitted)).

1 forfeited. See Greger v. Barnhart, 464 F.3d 968, 973 (9th Cir.
2 2006). Courts "will only excuse a failure to comply with this
3 rule when necessary to avoid a manifest injustice." Id. (citing
4 Meanel, 172 F.3d at 1115). "A manifest injustice is . . . an
5 error in the trial court that is direct, obvious, and
6 observable[.]" Sanchez v. Berryhill, No. 1:15-cv-00510-EPG, 2017
7 WL 1709326, at *3 (E.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (citation omitted); see
8 also Goodman v. Colvin, No. CV-15-00807-PHX-JAT, 2016 WL 4190738,
9 at *17-18 (D. Ariz. Aug. 9, 2016) (no manifest injustice in
10 forfeiture of claim when plaintiff failed to question VE about
11 conflicts between RFC limitations and DOT); Hinkley v. Colvin,
12 No. CV-15-00633-PHX-ESW, 2016 WL 3563663, at *10 n.7 (D. Ariz.
13 July 1, 2016) (no manifest injustice in forfeiture of claim when
14 plaintiff failed to challenge weight ALJ gave to medical
15 assessment); cf. Jones v. Colvin, No.: 2:15-cv-09489 KS, 2016 WL
16 4059624, at *3 & n.2 (C.D. Cal. July 27, 2016) (finding manifest
17 injustice when ALJ failed to reconcile RFC with DOT job
18 description because Ninth Circuit had previously found "an
19 apparent conflict between the [RFC] to perform simple, repetitive
20 tasks and the demands of Level Three Reasoning" (citation
21 omitted)).

22 In Oberg v. Astrue, 472 F. App'x 488 (9th Cir. 2012), the
23 Ninth Circuit considered whether a plaintiff had overcome the
24 continuing presumption of nondisability from a prior decision.
25 It rejected the plaintiff's arguments that the Chavez presumption
26 did not apply because the ALJ had reopened the prior decision and
27 because there had been a substantial change in her condition and
28 the ALJ had improperly discredited her related testimony. Id. at

1 489-90. Although the plaintiff had failed to raise the issue,
2 which would generally constitute a "waiver" of it, id. at 490
3 n.8, the court remanded for consideration of whether the
4 plaintiff's changed age category had rebutted the presumption of
5 continuing disability under Chavez given that Defendant had
6 himself raised the issue in his answering brief. Id. at 490-91.

7 2. Analysis

8 Because the ALJ applied Chavez, Plaintiff bore the burden of
9 showing a changed circumstance to rebut the presumption of
10 continuing nondisability. See 844 F.2d at 693; Taylor, 765 F.2d
11 at 875. She has not done so. She failed to raise the issue with
12 the ALJ (see AR 135-36 (request for hearing), 39-62 (hearing
13 transcript)), although he confirmed at the hearing that her
14 counsel had "explained the impact of [the prior] decision to her"
15 (AR 41). She did not raise it with the Appeals Council, either
16 (AR 374-75), or in the Joint Stipulation submitted to this Court
17 (see J. Stip. at 4-14). Nor did she respond to Defendant's
18 argument in the Joint Stipulation that res judicata precludes her
19 claim. (See id. at 20 (failing to reply to Defendant's
20 forfeiture argument, id. at 14-16).)

21 Unlike in Oberg, 472 F. App'x at 489-90, in which the
22 plaintiff's arguments on appeal centered on rebutting the Chavez
23 presumption, Plaintiff's lone claim here – that the ALJ failed to
24 credit her testimony – is not framed in any terms related to
25 Chavez or the continuing presumption of nondisability. (See J.
26 Stip. at 4-14.) Indeed, she mentions neither. (See generally
27 id.) She does not argue, as did the plaintiff in Oberg, that the
28 ALJ reopened the prior decision or that he erred in rejecting her

1 testimony that one of her conditions had worsened and was a
2 changed circumstance. See 472 F. App'x at 489-90. To the
3 contrary, her credibility claim is the garden-variety sort that
4 the Court sees frequently, alleging simply that the ALJ did not
5 give sufficient reasons for rejecting her testimony. (See J.
6 Stip. at 4-14.) Accordingly, her claim is forfeited.⁶ See
7 Greger, 464 F.3d at 973.

8 B. In Any Event, the ALJ Did Not Plainly Err in Partially
9 Rejecting Plaintiff's Subjective Symptom Statements,
10 and No Manifest Injustice Requires Reversal

11 As an initial matter, the ALJ afforded some weight to
12 Plaintiff's subjective complaints of significant pain: he limited
13 her to light work with various restrictions, including that she
14 alternate positions every hour and only occasionally engage in
15 such activities as climbing, balancing, and stooping. (AR 28.)
16 But to the extent the ALJ did reject her subjective complaints,
17 he provided two clear and convincing reasons for doing so.

19 ⁶ Because the ALJ found two new severe impairments since
20 Plaintiff's earlier denial (compare AR 68 (ALJ listing severe
21 impairments of fibromyalgia, sleep apnea, hypertension, hearing
22 loss, and asthma in Oct. 2011), with AR 26 (ALJ adding severe
23 impairments of obesity and Bell's Palsy in Apr. 2016, although
24 eliminating others), he was likely wrong in finding that the
25 rebuttable presumption of continuing nondisability applied – a
26 point never raised or conceded by Defendant here, unlike in
27 Oberg, 472 F. App'x at 490. See Lester, 81 F.3d at 827-28 (new
28 impairment is changed circumstance rebutting presumption).
Forfeiture nonetheless applies because the analysis of whether a
claim is forfeited is separate from whether the underlying claim
has merit. See, e.g., United States v. Drayton, No. PWG-13-
0251., 2014 WL 2919792, at *11 (D. Md. June 26, 2014) (noting
that claim "may have had merit" but nonetheless refusing to
consider it because Defendant had not raised it at trial or on
appeal).

1 First, he noted Plaintiff's failure to follow prescribed
2 courses of treatment, explaining that she "reportedly stopped
3 taking all of her medications despite being encouraged to
4 continue taking them, because she was convinced they were making
5 her worse." (AR 30 (citing AR 391 (notes from May 2013 office
6 visit indicating that Plaintiff had discontinued all
7 medications).) He also noted her failure to pursue physical
8 therapy. (AR 29 (citing AR 463 (Mar. 2015 referral to physical
9 therapy); see also AR 54 (plaintiff testifying at hearing that
10 she went to physical therapy only once because it "hurt too
11 much").)

12 That Plaintiff failed to follow prescribed courses of
13 treatment was a clear and convincing reason for discrediting her
14 allegations of disabling pain. See Tommasetti v. Astrue, 533
15 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2008) (ALJ may discount claimant's
16 testimony in light of "unexplained or inadequately explained
17 failure to seek treatment or to follow a prescribed course of
18 treatment" (citation omitted)); see also SSR 16-3p, 2016 WL
19 1119029, at *8 (Mar. 16, 2016)⁷ ("[I]f the individual fails to
20

21 ⁷ The Commissioner applies SSR 16-3p, which went into
22 effect a few weeks before the ALJ issued his decision, to all
23 "determinations and decisions on or after March 28, 2016." Soc.
24 Sec. Admin., Policy Interpretation Ruling, SSR 16-3p n.27,
25 <https://www.ssa.gov/OPHome/rulings/di/01/SSR2016-03-di-01.html>
26 (last visited Mar. 22, 2019). Though the new ruling eliminates
27 the term "credibility" and focuses on "consistency" instead,
28 Plaintiff refers to weighing "credibility" (J. Stip. at 5), and
much of the relevant case law uses that language too (see, e.g.,
id. at 5-6, 8-9 (discussing applicable case law)). As the Ninth
Circuit has clarified, SSR 16-3p

makes clear what our precedent already required: that
assessments of an individual's testimony by an ALJ are

1 follow prescribed treatment that might improve symptoms, we may
2 find the alleged intensity and persistence of an individual's
3 symptoms are inconsistent with the overall evidence of record.");
4 see also Donathan v. Astrue, 264 F. App'x 556, 558 (9th Cir.
5 2008) (finding that ALJ provided clear and convincing reasons for
6 rejecting claimant's subjective allegations regarding
7 fibromyalgia pain, including "unwillingness to seriously pursue
8 prescribed physical and medical therapies" and inconsistencies
9 regarding his need to use cane or scooter).⁸

10 Second, the ALJ properly discounted some of Plaintiff's
11 statements by identifying inconsistencies concerning them. (See
12 AR 29-31); Carmickle v. Comm'r, Soc. Sec. Admin., 533 F.3d 1155,
13 1161 (9th Cir. 2008); see also Smith v. Berryhill, 752 F. App'x
14 473, 475 (9th Cir. 2019) (ALJ properly discredited claimant's
15 testimony of fibromyalgia symptoms based on inconsistencies in
16 testimony, inconsistencies with activities of daily living, and
17 contradictory medical evidence); Haislip v. Astrue, 316 F. App'x

18
19 designed to "evaluate the intensity and persistence of
20 symptoms after [the ALJ] find[s] that the individual has
21 a medically determinable impairment(s) that could
22 reasonably be expected to produce those symptoms," and
not to delve into wide-ranging scrutiny of the claimant's
character and apparent truthfulness.

23 Trevizo v. Berryhill, 871 F.3d 664, 678 n.5 (9th Cir. 2017) (as
amended) (alterations in original) (quoting SSR 16-3p).

24 ⁸ Plaintiff argues that all treatment for fibromyalgia is
25 conservative in nature, and thus the ALJ improperly relied on her
26 purportedly conservative treatment to discredit her subjective
27 symptom testimony. (J. Stip. at 11-12.) As explained above,
28 however, he found her not credible based in part on her failure
to follow her doctors' prescribed courses of treatment –
medication and physical therapy – not because such treatment was
conservative in nature. (See AR 29-30.)

1 538, 539 (9th Cir. 2008) (ALJ properly discounted claimant's
2 subjective symptoms relating to fibromyalgia and migraines by
3 noting lack of objective medical evidence to support them,
4 inconsistencies between allegations and medical record, and
5 conflicts between alleged symptoms and activities of daily
6 living). For example, the ALJ noted that evidence contradicted
7 her statements that she had problems walking and needed a cane.
8 (See AR 30 (citing AR 537 (no cane at Aug. 2013 emergency-room
9 visit) & 559 (doctor at hospital noting that Plaintiff was
10 ambulatory, with steady gait).) The record also contradicted her
11 testimony about difficulty breathing while walking. (See AR 31.)
12 As the ALJ noted, her treatment records from August 2013
13 indicated normal breathing, with the last asthma attack more than
14 a year before then. (Id. (citing AR 550).) He noted that the
15 record contained no evidence of any subsequent asthma attacks
16 (id.) and that diagnostic images of her chest from 2012 and 2014
17 revealed negative findings (id. (citing AR 410 (May 2012), 431
18 (Jan. 2012), 619 (Jan. 2014))).

19 Plaintiff claims that the ALJ rejected her symptom testimony
20 based on the "legally insufficient" "belief that the testimony is
21 not credible because it lacks objective support in the record."⁹
22 (J. Stip. at 9.) "While subjective pain testimony cannot be
23 rejected on the sole ground that it is not fully corroborated by
24 objective medical evidence, the medical evidence is still a

26 ⁹ She also claims that the ALJ merely recited "boilerplate"
27 language and provided "no clue" as to what weight he gave her
28 testimony. (J. Stip. at 8-9.) This argument is disingenuous, as
the "boilerplate" is followed by the ALJ's lengthy evaluation of
her testimony and the evidence of record. (See AR 30-31.)

1 relevant factor in determining the severity of the claimant's
2 pain and its disabling effects." Rollins v. Massanari, 261 F.3d
3 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001) (holding that ALJ properly relied on
4 lack of objective medical evidence and other factors in
5 discrediting plaintiff's testimony about fibromyalgia symptoms
6 (citing 20 C.F.R. § 404.1529(c)(2))). In any event, as explained
7 above, the ALJ gave two valid reasons to support his partially
8 discrediting her testimony that she suffered from disabling pain:
9 her failure to follow prescribed courses of treatment and
10 specific inconsistencies between her complaints and the evidence
11 of record. (AR 30.)

12 Accordingly, the ALJ appears to have provided clear and
13 convincing reasons, supported by substantial evidence in the
14 record, to support his discounting of Plaintiff's subjective
15 symptom testimony, and no manifest injustice will result from not
16 considering her appeal because it has been forfeited.

17 **VI. CONCLUSION**

18 Consistent with the foregoing and under sentence four of 42
19 U.S.C. § 405(g),¹⁰ IT IS ORDERED that judgment be entered
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ¹⁰ That sentence provides: "The [district] court shall have
27 power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record,
28 a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the
Commissioner of Social Security, with or without remanding the
cause for a rehearing."

1 AFFIRMING the Commissioner's decision, DENYING Plaintiff's
2 request for reversal or remand, and DISMISSING this action with
3 prejudice.

4
5
6 DATED: March 25, 2019



JEAN ROSENBLUTH
U.S. Magistrate Judge